

R E M A R K S

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §103. These rejections are fully traversed below.

The claims have been amended to correct minor informalities and to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 6, 16, 21, 22, 28, 37 have been cancelled. Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-20, 23-27, 29-36, and 38-57 remain pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Frid et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,137,791, ('Frid' hereinafter) in view of Hiller et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,445,922, ('Hiller' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner admits that Frid does not specifically disclose the steps of providing a sub-NAI in the registration request, the sub-NAI uniquely identifying a session associated with the mobile node. The Examiner seeks to cure the deficiencies of Frid with Hiller.

Hiller discloses a method and system for support of overlapping IP addresses between an interworking function and a Mobile IP Foreign Agent. In the specification of this patent, there is some discussion of a mobile node that may have (i) more than one NAI and may request two (or more home addresses); or (ii) one NAI and two (or more) home addresses. See col. 5, lines 1-17. Thus, a mobile node may have two different NAIs and two (or more) home addresses or one NAI and two (or more) different home addresses. See col. 5, lines 47-50. In this example, the mobile node consists of a radio-equipped mobile phone or device connected to another computing device that has no built-in radio equipment.

In no manner does Hiller disclose or suggest the identification of a session associated with the Mobile Node via an identifier such as a sub-NAI. In fact, Hiller fails to disclose or suggest the use of a NAI extension combined with a sub-NAI extension to identify a particular session associated with a mobile node. Moreover, Hiller fails to disclose or suggest the problem that occurs when two different devices or applications have the same NAI. See p. 4, lines 19-20 of Applicant's specification. In addition, Hiller fails to teach a solution to such a problem. While Hiller does disclose the use of two or more home addresses with a single NAI, Hiller fails to disclose or suggest a mechanism for identifying two different sessions associated with a mobile node, which may have a single home address associated therewith (requiring IP addresses to be dynamically assigned for identification of the different sessions). Hiller also discloses the use of multiple NAIs, implying that the NAI may uniquely identify a session. As such, Hiller teaches away from the use of a NAI in association with a sub-NAI that identifies a session associated with the mobile node.

The present invention enables a mobile node and an associated session to be identified via a NAI and sub-NAI, respectively. Through the use of these combined identifiers, an IP address may be allocated and/or associated with both the NAI and sub-NAI. Hiller fails to disclose the use of a NAI and sub-NAI to identify a mobile node and associated session until an IP address can be allocated and/or associated therewith. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the cited references.

Even if the cited references were combined, Hiller fails to cure the deficiencies of Frid. In fact, the combination of the cited references would be inoperable for the intended purpose. Specifically, the claimed invention provides a sub-NAI uniquely identifying a session associated with a mobile node. This enables services for multiple sessions using a single mobile node. Specifically, the NAI and sub-NAI operate to identify a mobile node and associated session until an IP address associated therewith can be obtained or allocated. Even if the cited references were combined, Hiller suggests that multiple IP addresses are allocated initially (e.g., in the form of home addresses). As such, Hiller fails to allow for identification of sessions associated with a single NAI until an IP address can be associated therewith. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art.

The dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from the cited references. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103(a).

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. CISCP144).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Elise R. Heilbrunn
Reg. No. 42,649

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, California 94704
Tel. (510) 843-6200